

P & A Program Performance Report PADD PPR

Grantee: Indiana
Reporting Period: 10/01/2009 - 09/30/2010

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160
Expiration Date: 09/30/2011

Report Sections

Section 1 Identification

Section 2 Individual Clients Served

Section 2 County List

Section 3 Case Problem Areas of Individual Clients Served

Section 4 Interventions on Behalf of Groups of Clients

Section 5 Non-Case Directed Services

*** Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals:**

Priority 1 Indicator 1 Abuse/Neglect

*** Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals:**

Priority 1 Indicator 2 Monitoring of Deaths

*** Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals:**

Priority 2 Indicator 1 Denial of FAPE

*** Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals:**

Priority 2 Indicator 2 ADA/Fair Housing Violation

*** Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals:**

Priority 2 Indicator 3 Reduction in Waiver Service

*** Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals:**

Priority 2 Indicator 4 Systemic Based Discrimination

*** Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals:**

Priority 2 Indicator 5 Educational Seclusion and

*** Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals:**

Priority 3 Indicator 1 Education and Training

*** Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals:**

Priority 3 Indicator 2 Self Advocate Support

* Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals:
Priority 3 Indicator 3 Child Care Education and T
* Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals:
Priority 3 Indicator 4 Groups and Committees
* Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals:
Priority 3 Indicator 5 Cooperative Housing Proje
* Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals:
Priority 4 Indicator 1 Information and Referral
* Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals:
Priority 4 Indicator 2 Mnority and Underserved
Section 7 Developmental Disabilities Network Collaboration
* Section 7 Issues/Barriers Elaboration:
Pathways to Empowerment
Section 8 Coordination
Section 9 Comments and Clarifications

P & A Program Performance Report PADD PPR

Grantee: Indiana

Reporting Period: 10/01/2009 - 09/30/2010

Section 1 Identification

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Expiration Date: 09/30/2011

State: IN	Reporting Period: 10/01/2009	To: 09/30/2010
P&A Agency Name: Executive Director		
Contact Person Last Name: Gallagher First Name: Thomas MI: R		
Phone Number: (317) 722-5555 Ext. 226		

Section 2 Individual Clients Served

A. Number of Individual Clients (Number of Persons with Disabilities Receiving Individual Advocacy):	
1. Number of clients receiving advocacy at start of fiscal year:	70
2. Number of new/renewed clients represented during fiscal year:	79
Total:	149

3. If program income was used to supplement the PADD allotment for the reporting period, estimate the number of individuals served as a result of program income dollars:		0
4. Number of individuals requesting individual advocacy and who are eligible under the PADD program but did not receive such		0
B. Number of Case Problems of Individual Clients		166
C. Number of Individual Clients by Age:		
Age 0 to 2:		0
Age 3 to 4:		0
Age 5 to 22:		41
Age 23 to 59:		90
Age 60 and over:		18
Total Clients:		149
D. Number of Individual Clients by Sex:		
Number of Male:		90
Number of Female:		59
Total Clients:		149
E. Number of Individual Clients by Racial/ Ethnic Background:	Single Response	Multiple Response
Asian:	0	0
Black or African American:	26	0
Hispanic / Latino:	2	0
American Indian or Alaskan Native:	0	0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander:	0	0
White:	121	2
Multiple Response:	0	
Information Not Provided:	0	
Total Clients:	149	
F. Number of Individual Clients by Geographic Location:	In-State	Out-of-State
Urban (metropolitan area with population of 50,000 or more):	89	0
Rural (all other):	60	0
Total Clients:	149	0
G. Clients Living Arrangements		Number of

	Individual Clients
Independent	3
Parental or other Family Home	30
Community Residential Home	89
Foster Care	0
Nursing Home	14
Public (State Operated Institutional Living Arrangement	7
Private Institutional Living Arrangement	3
Legal Detention / Jail / Prison / Detention Center	2
Homeless	0
Federal Facility (List)	0
Other	0
Information not provided	1
Total Client Cases by Living Arrangement	149
H. Individual Clients Disability	Number of Individual Clients
Autism	19
Cerebral Palsy	11
AIDS/HIV	0
Epilepsy	2
Mental Illness	2
Intellectual Disability	106
Muscular Dystrophy	0
Spina Bifida	1
Learning Disabilities	3
Traumatic Brain Injuries (TBI) and other head injuries	0
Tourette Syndrome	0
Visual Impairment / Blind	0
Hard of Hearing / Deaf	1
Other Physical / Orthopedic *	2
Other Emotional / Behavioral *	0
Other Intellectual *	2

Disability Unknown	0	
Total Disabilities	149	
Sections	Name of Disability	Number of Clients
Disability Breakout 1	Qquadraplegia	1
Disability Breakout 2	Crane-Heise Syndrome	1
Disability Breakout 3	Developmental delays	2

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: Indiana

Reporting Period: 10/01/2009 - 09/30/2010

Section 2 County List

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Expiration Date: 09/30/2011

	County Name	Total Population	Number of Individual Clients
1	ADAMS	33,985	0
2	ALLEN	350,523	18
3	BARTHOLOMEW	75,360	1
4	BENTON	8,679	0
5	BLACKFORD	13,093	0
6	BOONE	55,029	0
7	BROWN	14,550	0
8	CARROLL	19,864	1
9	CASS	39,123	3
10	CLARK	106,673	4
11	CLAY	26,703	0
12	CLINTON	34,069	0
13	CRAWFORD	10,624	0
14	DAVISS	30,147	0
15	DEARBORN	49,985	0
16	DECATUR	24,998	0
17	DE KALB	41,884	2

18	DELAWARE	114,685	0
19	DUBOIS	41,449	0
20	ELKHART	199,137	1
21	FAYETTE	24,265	1
22	FLOYD	73,780	0
23	FOUNTAIN	17,041	0
24	FRANKLIN	23,343	0
25	FULTON	20,319	0
26	GIBSON	32,666	0
27	GRANT	68,609	5
28	GREENE	32,577	1
29	HAMILTON	269,785	1
30	HANCOCK	67,282	2
31	HARRISON	37,067	0
32	HENDRICKS	137,240	3
33	HENRY	47,162	0
34	HOWARD	83,381	1
35	HUNTINGTON	37,570	0
36	JACKSON	42,193	0
37	JASPER	32,544	0
38	JAY	21,412	1
39	JEFFERSON	32,820	0
40	JENNINGS	28,040	0
41	JOHNSON	139,158	4
42	KNOX	38,057	4
43	KOSCIUSKO	76,275	1
44	LAGRANGE	37,172	0
45	LAKE	493,800	8
46	LA PORTE	110,888	0
47	LAWRENCE	45,913	2
48	MADISON	131,501	5
49	MARION	880,380	35
50	MARSHALL	46,709	0
51	MARTIN	9,969	0

52	MIAMI	36,219	0
53	MONTGOMERY	37,805	0
54	MONROE	128,992	6
55	MORGAN	70,668	3
56	NEWTON	13,933	0
57	NOBLE	47,601	1
58	OHIO	5,773	0
59	ORANGE	19,571	0
60	OWEN	22,375	0
61	PARKE	17,152	0
62	PERRY	18,929	1
63	PIKE	12,569	0
64	PORTER	162,181	2
65	POSEY	26,079	1
66	PULASKI	13,712	0
67	PUTNAM	37,183	0
68	RANDOLPH	25,801	0
69	RIPLEY	27,400	0
70	RUSH	17,297	1
71	ST JOSEPH	266,680	13
72	SCOTT	23,627	0
73	SHELBY	44,186	3
74	SPENCER	20,111	0
75	STARKE	23,658	0
76	STEUBEN	33,368	0
77	SULLIVAN	21,628	0
78	SWITZERLAND	9,696	0
79	TIPPECANOE	164,237	9
80	TIPTON	15,923	1
81	UNION	7,157	0
82	VANDEBURGH	174,729	3
83	VERMILLION	16,234	0
84	VIGO	105,968	0
85	WABASH	32,706	1

86	WARREN	8,547	0
87	WARRICK	57,656	0
88	WASHINGTON	27,969	0
89	WAYNE	67,795	0
90	WELLS	27,964	0
91	WHITE	23,800	0
92	WHITLEY	32,667	0

P & A Program Performance Report PADD PPR

Grantee: Indiana

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/01/2009 - 09/30/2010

Expiration Date: 09/30/2011

Section 3 Case Problem Areas of Individual Clients Served

This is the total number of problems addressed by the PADD program and collected at case closure. This will allow the PADD program to better determine the outcome of its work. This can be more than the number of problems presented upon intake that is the total number reported in Section 2 B.

A. The outcome of problems addressed for Individual Clients:

1. Number of persons with developmental disabilities living in institutions served by the P&A whose complaint of abuse, neglect, discrimination of their rights was remedied by the P&A:	8
2. Number of persons with developmental disabilities living in the community served by the P&A whose complaint of abuse, neglect, discrimination of their rights was remedied by the P&A:	61

B. Types of problems addressed by area of emphasis:

1. Quality Assurance including abuse, neglect & other violations of rights	59
2. Education and early intervention	15
3. Child care	0
4. Health care	4
5. Employment	0
6. Housing	1
7. Transportation	0
8. Recreation	1
Total Case Problem Areas of Individual Clients Addressed upon closure	80

C. Reasons for Closing Individual's Case Files:

1. Issues resolved partially or completely in the individual's favor	70
2. Other representation found	0
3. Individual withdrew complaint	2
4. Appeals were unsuccessful	0
5. PADD services were not needed due to individual's death, relocation, etc.	1
6. PADD withdrew because individual would not cooperate	7
7. PADD unable to take care because of lack of resources	0
8. Individual's case lacks merit	0
9. Other	0
D. Intervention Strategies Used in Serving Individuals: (List the highest level of Intervention used by PADD prior to closing each case file.)	
1. Technical assistance in self-advocacy	6
2. Short-term assistance	13
3. Investigation / monitoring	49
4. Negotiation	6
5. Mediation / alternative dispute resolution	4
6. Administrative hearings	0
7. Litigation	2
E. Satisfaction of Individuals Served:	
1. Number of satisfaction surveys distributed	70
2. Number of satisfaction surveys returned during the year	9
3. Of the total number of surveys returned, indicate how many individuals rated their overall satisfaction with PADD in the following ways:	
a. Satisfied	9
b. Not satisfied	0
4. Number of client grievances filed under the client grievance procedure	0

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: Indiana
Reporting Period: 10/01/2009 - 09/30/2010
Section 4 Interventions on Behalf of Groups of Clients

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160
Expiration Date: 09/30/2011

A. Summary Data	Number of cases	Potential number of individuals impacted	Number of cases concluded successfully	Number of cases concluded unsuccessfully	Number of cases pending
Summary Data on Group Advocacy Intervention	31	175,000	14	6	11
Summary Data on Investigations Intervention	120	19,759	52	2	66
Summary Data on Monitoring Activities Intervention	0	19,759	0	0	0
Summary Data on Court-Ordered Monitoring Activities Intervention	0	0	0	0	0
Summary Data on Systemic or Class-action Litigation Intervention	0	0	0	0	0
Summary Data on all Group Interventions	151	214,518	66	8	77

B. Group Advocacy:

1. What are the major issues addressed?

Special Educational Services inappropriately reduced or denied through suspension or expulsion. Non compliance in targeted school systems for IDEA, FAPE, 504, 508. Denial of reasonable accommodations under Title 2 or 3 of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) or under Fair Housing Law.

2. Which groups are likely to be affected?

All students in Special Education. Individuals with Intellectual and other Developmental Disabilities (ID/DD) denied reasonable accommodations under titles 2 or 3 of the ADA or Fair Housing Law.

3. What have been the major outcomes during the fiscal year?

Increased compliance with IDEA, FAPE, 504, and 508, ADA and Fair Housing. Secured or restored special education services for Individuals with ID/DDs who were denied due to suspension or expulsion. Individuals with ID/DDs graduated on time with their class. Suspensions and expulsions were reversed. IEPs were changed to meet the needs of Individuals with ID/DDs. Institutional placements were averted and community placements secured.

Information about rights and strategies was secured. Clients took action to advocate on their own behalf. Increased access for individuals with ID/DDs.

4. How do these outcomes contribute to the long-term objectives as stated in the Statement of Objectives and Priorities?

Long term objective is reduction of discrimination i.e., reduce denial and access based on disability. Increased compliance with ADA, Fair Housing, IDEA, FAPE, 504 and 508 results in increased access to educational services, affordable housing for Individuals with ID/DDs.

C. Full Investigations:

1. What are the major areas of investigation?

Abuse and or Neglect Allegations

2. Which groups are likely to be affected?

Individuals with Intellectual and other Developmental Disabilities residing in institutions or in the community who are alleged to have been abused and/or neglected.

3. What have been the major outcomes during the fiscal year?

Allegations of abuse and neglect were validated and abuse/neglect reduced or stopped. Environments were changed resulting in an increase of safety and welfare of Individuals with ID/DDs. Persons discharged from the last remaining State Developmental Center (SDC) were followed to assure needed services were delivered. Policies of providers of community residential placements were added and or changed/improved, resulting in increased health and safety of Individuals with ID/DDs. Information about rights and strategies was secured resulting in increased ability to self advocate.

4. How do these outcomes contribute to the long-term objectives as stated in the Statement of Objectives and Priorities?

These outcomes all reduced and/or eliminated abuse and/or neglect resulting in the opportunity for Individuals with Intellectual and other Developmental Disabilities to live more independently and productively.

D. Monitoring:

1. What are the major areas of non-court ordered monitoring?

1. Monitor selected death investigations of Individuals with Intellectual and other Developmental Disabilities that resided in state supported settings to document that an investigation was initiated and completed by the responsible state entity. 2. Survey of selected closed PADD cases to determine level of satisfaction and impact of advocacy.

2. Which groups are likely to be affected?

Individuals with Intellectual and other Developmental Disabilities who died in a state supported institutional or community residential setting. Clients served through PADD.

3. What have been the major outcomes during the fiscal year?

IPAS will continue to advocate for Adult Protective Services (APS) to meet statutory responsibility. State's Mortality Review Committee still fails to rev. complaints in timely fashion; continue to advise state Bureau of Quality Improvement Services of these deaths; changes made by providers for important health & safety of living IWDD's: staff suspended or terminated, add training provided for staff re: future neglect of IWDD's i.e. when to call 911, med admin & documenting, dysphasia recognition, monitoring during eating, procedures for

conduct & document of bed checks, & correct admin of emergency procedures. Made recommendations to providers for formalization of internal reports.

4. How do these outcomes contribute to the long-term objectives as stated in the Statement of Objectives and Priorities?

Timely death investigations may identify weaknesses in the service delivery system and result in an increase of health and safety and improved quality assurance.

E. Court Ordered Monitoring:

1. What are the major areas of court ordered monitoring?

There were no court ordered monitoring activities during FY 2010.

2. Which groups are likely to be affected?

N/A

3. What have been the major outcomes during the fiscal year?

N/A

4. How do these outcomes contribute to the long-term objectives as stated in the Statement of Objectives and Priorities?

N/A

F. Systems or Class Action Litigation:

1. What are the major areas of litigation?

There was no systems or class action litigation during FY 2010.

2. Which groups are likely to be affected?

N/A

3. What have been the major outcomes during the fiscal year?

N/A

4. How do these outcomes contribute to the long-term objectives as stated in the Statement of Objectives and Priorities?

N/A

G. Other Systems Change Activities:

1. What are the major areas of systems change activities?

Due to lack of information regarding characteristics of disabilities, the Criminal Justice System discriminates against Individuals with Intellectual and other Developmental Disabilities resulting in inappropriate arrest and lack of appropriate treatment during confinement.

2. Which groups are likely to be affected?

Individuals with Intellectual and other Developmental Disabilities at risk of entering or in the Criminal Justice System. State corrections and law enforcement staff who do not understand development disabilities or disability rights.

3. What have been the major outcomes during the fiscal year?

State DD Network partners continued to work with other state leaders to meet and discuss issues pertinent to at risk Individuals with Intellectual and other Developmental Disabilities. All hard copies of the TIPS cards for Law Enforcement and Corrections Personnel publication have been distributed. Interested persons are now directed to the IPAS website for copies of the publication.

TIPS can also be uploaded to a CD and used in a police patrol car computer.

4. How do these outcomes contribute to the long-term objectives as stated in the Statement of Objectives and Priorities?

Provision of accurate and timely information to state corrections and law enforcement personnel about the disability rights of Individuals with Intellectual and other Developmental Disabilities and their families, advocates, guardians, and other professionals will assist Individuals with Intellectual and other Developmental Disabilities and their families in asserting their rights and increase their level of empowerment.

5. Number of people with disabilities impacted?

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: Indiana

Reporting Period: 10/01/2009 - 09/30/2010

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Expiration Date: 09/30/2011

Section 5 Non-Case Directed Services

A. Information and Referral Services:	
(Individual Non-Case I&R) Total I&R	553
B. Public Education and Training Activities	
1. Number of Education / Training Activities Undertaken	64
2. Total number of persons trained (approximate)	2,709
C. Number of Information Dissemination Activities by type:	
1. Radio TV appearances	0
2 Newspaper articles	0
3. PSAs / video / films / etc. aired	0
4. Report disseminated	0
5. Publications disseminated	17,368
6. Information about P&A disseminated (include general training / outreach or presentations not included in training activities)	0
7. Number of hits on Website	63,425
8. Other media activities	0
Describe other media activities:	
Outcome Statement:	
Number of persons who received information about the P&A and its services	83,000
Number of persons with disabilities (or their family members) who	58,100

received education or training about their rights, enabling them to be more effective self-advocates			
D. Number of Consumers on Board by type:	Governing Board	Advisory Council	
Primary consumers	2	0	
Secondary consumers	4	0	
Other consumers with disabilities	0	0	
Total people	6	0	
E. Number of People on Board by Racial / Ethnic type:	P&A Staff	Governing Board	Advisory Council
African American	3	1	0
Hispanic American	0	0	0
Asian American	0	0	0
Native American	0	0	0
Other Racial / Ethnic	0	0	0
Total People	3	1	0
Does the PADD program utilize volunteers? No			
If so, describe how?			

P & A Program Performance Report PADD PPR

Grantee: Indiana

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/01/2009 - 09/30/2010

Expiration Date: 09/30/2011

Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals: Priority 1 Indicator 1 Abuse/Neglect

List reporting year priorities from the Statement of Objectives and Priorities in order by priority.

For each priority, provide the following information:

1. Priority number: 1	Priority Description: Reduce/eliminate abuse/neglect of individuals with ID/DD
2. Identify and describe indicators PADD used to determine successful outcome of activities pursued under this priority:	
Indicator number: 1	Indicator Description: Review 90 allegations of abuse/neglect
Indicator is: Met	
If "Not Met" was checked, explain:	
If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that	

exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed:

IPAS monitoring of responsible entities investigations resulted in the following actions being taken to protect our clients' health, safety and welfare: 1. One client who was financially exploited by staff had the money returned to their account; 2. ICF-MR staff not following one client's dining plan were retrained by the provider and the provider was cited for this incident in their annual survey by the Indiana State Department of Health; 3. One client whose needs as a person with a DD/MI/hearing impairment diagnosis were not being addressed was moved to a safe and appropriate placement with a new provider. She is now receiving services from persons who can effectively communicate with her; 4. Two clients' staff received training on the appropriate reporting of a suspected incident of abuse or neglect; 5. One client's staff was retrained in lifting, transferring and supporting persons so as not to cause breaks in bones.

3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable):

One provider of residential services changed their emergency medical procedures such that when a client receives a head injury, staff will seek immediate medical attention from the agency RN or an emergency medical provider; such injury will be documented using an Incident/Accident form, with subsequent observations documented and significant changes in behavior or health reported to the manager on call.

4. Explain whether pursuing this priority involved collaborative efforts by other entities. If so, describe this collaboration:

The state Bureau of Quality Improvement Services (BQIS) provides IPAS with weekly incident reports of abuse and neglect filed by providers of community residential services. IPAS reviews these reports and uses sentinel events of abuse/neglect with which to open cases.

5. If this was this addressed through individual advocacy, provide the number of cases handled under the priority.

120

6. If this priority addressed systemic advocacy or capacity building of the service delivery system for persons with developmental disabilities, please describe how including indicating if any were class actions.

1. One private ICF provider modified its abuse and neglect investigation policy to state that investigations would be completed in 5 days, with the results reported to the Executive Director or designee by the fifth day. The bed capacity of this facility is 318. 2. Staff for the provider in number 1 were re-trained to use conversational tone and to be aware of how others perceive interactions. 3. One group home and waiver residential provider's abuse/neglect policy was revised so that the agency to whom abuse/neglect is reported is accurately listed within the policy. This provider serves over 200 individuals.

7. Was this priority targeted to under/unserved and minority populations? If so please describe whether or not services to the targeted population resulted in an increase in clients served.

No.

8. Provide at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the priority.

One client lives in a supported living apartment. Her friend called IPAS to report that the provider did not administer Clozaril/Clozapine for a period of at least seven days. She further stated that client's psychological condition deteriorated to the point where she was almost in a catatonic state when she made a social visit to the home and the client had to be taken to the

hospital that same day. The state Bureau of Quality Improvement Services (BQIS) investigated the incident, substantiated provider abuse and filed a complaint with the Attorney General's office regarding the two nurses who were in charge of monitoring care. Other outcomes resulting from IPAS assistance: a new protocol was established for individuals receiving Clozaril/Clozapine and staff was re-trained.

9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority? \$221,000

10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year ?Yes

P & A Program Performance Report PADD PPR

Grantee: Indiana

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/01/2009 - 09/30/2010

Expiration Date: 09/30/2011

Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals: Priority 1 Indicator 2 Monitoring of Deaths

List reporting year priorities from the Statement of Objectives and Priorities in order by priority.

For each priority, provide the following information:

1. Priority number: 1	Priority Description: Reduce/eliminate abuse/neglect of individuals with ID/DD
------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2. Identify and describe indicators PADD used to determine successful outcome of activities pursued under this priority:

Indicator number: 2	Indicator Description: Monitoring of ID/DD Deaths
----------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------

Indicator is: Met

If "Not Met" was checked, explain:

If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed:

The state Bureau of Quality Improvement Services (BQIS) provides IPAS with all reports of deaths as well as statistical data which IPAS uses to analyze trends which suggest provider abuse/neglect. Comparing FY 2010 with FY 2009 and FY 2008, deaths in waiver homes, group homes and nursing homes were analyzed for four factors: 1. number of deaths reported to the police, 2. number of deaths reported to Adult Protective Services, 3. the time that the death was reported, and 4. number of deaths where the provider or oversight agency was not provided. No pattern of neglect was noted in the number of deaths reported to the police. The number of deaths in waiver homes not reported to Adult Protective Services (APS) has increased in number and will be brought to the attention of the state DDRS Director as waiver home service providers have a statutory obligation to report deaths to APS. No pattern of neglect was noted in the time of death reported.

<p>3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable): Although the number of incidents with “unreported” decreased between FY 2009 and FY 2010, 23% of all deaths reported for FY 2010 (351) still had no provider or oversight agency named, even after IPAS brought the matter to the attention of BQIS in FY 2009. This information will be provided by IPAS to the DDRS Director for her consideration.</p>
<p>4. Explain whether pursuing this priority involved collaborative efforts by other entities. If so, describe this collaboration: Without reports from BQIS, IPAS would not have been able to complete its analysis.</p>
<p>5. If this was this addressed through individual advocacy, provide the number of cases handled under the priority. Not a case related indicator.</p>
<p>6. If this priority addressed systemic advocacy or capacity building of the service delivery system for persons with developmental disabilities, please describe how including indicating if any were class actions. IPAS is an ex-officio member of the state DD Community Residential Facilities Council (CRFC). The CRFC receives a summary report on deaths and reviews individual cases on an as needed basis. These cases are presented by the Bureau of Quality Improvement Service (BQIS) and the Indiana State Department of Health (ISDH). By these reviews the CRFC is looking system wide at reasons why deaths occur and whether or not abuse/neglect is involved. No reports were provided to the CRFC by BQIS during FY 2010.</p>
<p>7. Was this priority targeted to under/unserved and minority populations? If so please describe whether or not services to the targeted population resulted in an increase in clients served. No</p>
<p>8. Provide at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the priority. Not a case related indicator.</p>
<p>9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority? \$0</p>
<p>10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year ?Yes</p>

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: Indiana

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/01/2009 - 09/30/2010

Expiration Date: 09/30/2011

Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals: Priority 2 Indicator 1 Denial of FAPE

List reporting year priorities from the Statement of Objectives and Priorities in order by priority.

For each priority, provide the following information:

1. Priority number: 2	Priority Description: Disability Related Rights Denial & Discrimination
------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2. Identify and describe indicators PADD used to determine successful outcome of activities pursued under this priority:

Indicator number: 1	Indicator Description: Reduction or Termination of Educational Services
----------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Indicator is:Met

If "Not Met" was checked, explain:

If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed:
The successful intervention of IPAS advocates had the following results: In two of the closed cases, the advocate worked with the family and school on developing an appropriate program and placement that would address the behavioral needs of the student. Additionally, in each case the school agreed to provide compensatory time to amend the lost educational instruction that occurred during the suspensions. In another closure, the case conference committee agreed to the parent's request for her son to be reinstated at a different school. One closure occurred after the school agreed to provide the student transportation to and from school on the special education bus with an aide.

3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable):

Indianapolis Public School (IPS) disciplinary records of currently enrolled students could only be accessed by the building Administrator and if the child changed schools or districts the information did not always go with the child and could not be accessed by the child's new building Administrator. The Indiana Department Of Education (IDOE) ordered that IPS would develop a procedure to change this practice. IDOE directed IPS to ensure a child's disciplinary records went with the child, just as a child's education records. This change currently affects 33,372 children, latest number of enrolled IPS students.

4. Explain whether pursuing this priority involved collaborative efforts by other entities. If so, describe this collaboration:

N/A

5. If this was this addressed through individual advocacy, provide the number of cases handled under the priority.

23

6. If this priority addressed systemic advocacy or capacity building of the service delivery system for persons with developmental disabilities, please describe how including indicating if any were class actions.

Norwell High School did not have an accessible route into the school. The curb cuts were not appropriately identified as a no parking zone and there was no painted cross walk from the accessible parking to the curb cuts. The changes made affect all students, parents and visitors with disabilities. The curb cuts are now clearly identified as a no parking zone and the Principal agreed to paint the appropriate route when the weather is appropriate to paint outside.

7. Was this priority targeted to under/served and minority populations? If so please describe whether or not services to the targeted population resulted in an increase in clients served.

No.

<p>8. Provide at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the priority. IPAS received call from mother of child suspended from middle school. A manifestation determination review (MDR) was going to be held to determine either alternative placement or expulsion. The mother did not want her son in the alternative school as she believed that behavioral issues would increase as he tended to be a follower & would copy the negative behaviors of other students. IPAS attended the MDR and was able to present valid reasons for child's continued placement at his middle school. IPAS was also able to recommend to the school that the present behavioral plan needed to be updated for child to be successful. IPAS intervention resulted in the school adding goals, objectives, accommodations, and modifications to child's Individualized Education Plan. Also due to IPAS intervention, the child continued to attend the middle school without any interruption in educational services. He is no longer facing suspension and still attends a full day of school.</p>
<p>9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority ? \$200,000</p>
<p>10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year ? Yes</p>

P & A Program Performance Report PADD PPR

Grantee: Indiana

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/01/2009 - 09/30/2010

Expiration Date: 09/30/2011

Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals: Priority 2 Indicator 2 ADA/Fair Housing Violations

List reporting year priorities from the Statement of Objectives and Priorities in order by priority.	
For each priority, provide the following information:	
1. Priority number: 2	Priority Description: Disability Related Rights Denial & Discrimination
2. Identify and describe indicators PADD used to determine successful outcome of activities pursued under this priority:	
Indicator number: 2	Indicator Description: Service Denial under the ADA or Fair Housing Laws
Indicator is: Met	
If "Not Met" was checked, explain:	
<p>If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed: IPAS intervention caused 1. The management company for a strip mall to restripe and relocate four accessible parking spaces, moving them to a central location in front of the mall, making it the shortest accessible route of travel to an accessible mall entrance; 2. One Indianapolis restaurant to modify the curb cut in front of its business and it is now compliant with the ADA; the curb cut now has an accessible route with 48 inches of clear space; 3. One client to obtain a ground floor apartment that is accessible for her and her child.</p>	

3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable):

Outreach efforts were made in FY 2010 to Centers for Independent Living, to waiver case managers and to 40 Powerful Parents of Indiana Chapters. These efforts were directed toward informing the above organizations of IPAS' advocacy available in the area of ADA and Fair Housing violations.

4. Explain whether pursuing this priority involved collaborative efforts by other entities. If so, describe this collaboration:

The ADA in Your Community Poll closed in June 2010. Overall, ADA-Indiana received the comments of 886 Indiana participants. The ADA Poll was a joint project of ADA-Indiana, the Great Lakes ADA Center, the Governor's Council for People with Disabilities, Indiana Protection and Advocacy Systems, and the Indiana Institute on Disability and Community. Indiana's Poll was part of a larger six-state effort to collect information about people's appraisal of how the ADA has been implemented in their communities, given that it has been 20 years since the law was enacted. Of all six states (Indiana, Illinois, Ohio, Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin), Indiana had highest number of respondents. In all, more than 3,500 people offered their opinions. The ADA Poll was conducted by staff from the Indiana Institute's Center for Planning and Policy Studies using their online survey tool and support systems.

5. If this was this addressed through individual advocacy, provide the number of cases handled under the priority.

Eight cases were handled under this indicator during FY 2010. Thirty-three projects, i.e., IPAS review of an ADA or Fair Housing violation that does not have a specific client who brought the issue to IPAS, were also handled under this indicator during FY 2010.

6. If this priority addressed systemic advocacy or capacity building of the service delivery system for persons with developmental disabilities, please describe how including indicating if any were class actions.

7. Was this priority targeted to under/unserved and minority populations? If so please describe whether or not services to the targeted population resulted in an increase in clients served.

No.

8. Provide at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the priority.

Upon written notification by IPAS to the board of trustees that two community library parking lots did not comply with the ADA or Indiana Code, IPAS was advised by the board president that all necessary work to make both parking lots ADA and Indiana Code compliant would be undertaken. Outcome: IPAS monitoring determined that the both the Anderson and Lapel Public Libraries completed the remediation necessary to satisfy the requirements of the ADA and Indiana Code in regard to accessible parking, restriping and signage. The potential number of customers with disabilities impacted annually by the parking lot improvements for both libraries is 9378 individuals.

9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority ? \$0

10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year ? Yes

P & A Program Performance Report PADD PPR

Grantee: Indiana

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/01/2009 - 09/30/2010

Expiration Date: 09/30/2011

Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals: Priority 2 Indicator 3 Reduction in Waiver Services

List reporting year priorities from the Statement of Objectives and Priorities in order by priority.

For each priority, provide the following information:

1. Priority number: 2

Priority Description: Disability Related Rights Denial & Discrimination

2. Identify and describe indicators PADD used to determine successful outcome of activities pursued under this priority:

Indicator number: 3

Indicator Description: Advocate for DD Waiver Recipients whose Health & Safety is at Risk

Indicator is: Partially Met/Continuing

If "Not Met" was checked, explain:

If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed:
Eight clients received services under this indicator during FY 2010. IPAS intervention resulted in 1. One client did not received a reduction in service hours and the provider continued to provide three hours of service at no cost to the state because they believed that these hours were needed and beneficial to the client; 2. One client continued to receive 24/7 care even though the budget submitted supported only 19.3 hours of services per day; 3. One client took action to advocate on their own behalf.

3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable):

The family of an individual receiving services under the DD Waiver contacted IPAS with concerns regarding the fact their loved one's service hours were to be drastically cut, from 22 daily hours to 2 hours per week. IPAS agreed to assess the situation as such a dramatic reduction of hours would be detrimental to the individual's safety and general welfare. The IPAS review resulted in the finding that the formal notification of the reduction in hours had not yet taken place and that the case manager who had prepared the budget that was presented to the family did not use the correct figures with which to determine service needs. When the formal notification came, compared to the previous year's budget, only 1.39 hours of service per day was lost. The family and the provider agreed that they would find a way to cover the lost hours at no cost to the state. IPAS therefore did not need to assist in an appeal action, as a solution was reached by the provider and family.

4. Explain whether pursuing this priority involved collaborative efforts by other entities. If so, describe this collaboration:

N/A

5. If this was this addressed through individual advocacy, provide the number of cases handled under the priority.

8
6. If this priority addressed systemic advocacy or capacity building of the service delivery system for persons with developmental disabilities, please describe how including indicating if any were class actions. N/A
7. Was this priority targeted to under/unserved and minority populations? If so please describe whether or not services to the targeted population resulted in an increase in clients served. No
8. Provide at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the priority. One client has disabilities that require skilled nursing hours overnight. The Medicaid office had eliminated the overnight hours, believing that client's father could perform the nursing tasks. After the case pended for some time and a new judge was appointed for the retiring judge, the court issued a favorable ruling for our client, reversing the denial of overnight nursing hours. At the time of this writing, the deadline for filing an appeal to the state court of appeals has elapsed and no appeal was filed.
9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority ? \$0
10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year ? Yes

P & A Program Performance Report PADD PPR

Grantee: Indiana

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/01/2009 - 09/30/2010

Expiration Date: 09/30/2011

Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals: Priority 2 Indicator 4 Systemic Based Discrimination

List reporting year priorities from the Statement of Objectives and Priorities in order by priority.	
For each priority, provide the following information:	
1. Priority number: 2	Priority Description: Disability Related Rights Denial & Discrimination
2. Identify and describe indicators PADD used to determine successful outcome of activities pursued under this priority:	
Indicator number: 4	Indicator Description: Open 3 Cases that may have Systemic Implications
Indicator is: Partially Met/Continuing	
If "Not Met" was checked, explain:	
If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed:	

Two service requests, i.e., review of allegations, on behalf of two clients received services under this objective in FY 2010. A mother who alleged that her child had been placed in an isolation room without the benefit of an Individualized Education Plan withdrew her child from the school and IPAS had no grounds to proceed further. The case was then closed.

3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable):

None

4. Explain whether pursuing this priority involved collaborative efforts by other entities. If so, describe this collaboration:

N/A

5. If this was this addressed through individual advocacy, provide the number of cases handled under the priority.

2

6. If this priority addressed systemic advocacy or capacity building of the service delivery system for persons with developmental disabilities, please describe how including indicating if any were class actions.

N/A

7. Was this priority targeted to under/unserved and minority populations? If so please describe whether or not services to the targeted population resulted in an increase in clients served.

No

8. Provide at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the priority.

A ten year old boy became unmanageable in his day care setting and the local police department was called. The officer who responded used a taser on the child. IPAS is in the process of reviewing the records of the local police department and the special prosecutor in order to determine further action. As of the time of this writing, no formal action has been taken against the officer who tased the child.

9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority ? \$0

10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year ?Yes

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: Indiana

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/01/2009 - 09/30/2010

Expiration Date: 09/30/2011

Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals: Priority 2 Indicator 5 Educational Seclusion and Restraint

List reporting year priorities from the Statement of Objectives and Priorities in order by priority.

For each priority, provide the following information:

1. Priority number: 2	Priority Description: Disability Related Rights Denial &
------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------

	Discrimination
2. Identify and describe indicators PADD used to determine successful outcome of activities pursued under this priority:	
Indicator number: 5	Indicator Description: Inappropriate seclusion & restraint in classroom
Indicator is: Met	
If "Not Met" was checked, explain:	
<p>If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed:</p> <p>In the IPAS 2006 statewide survey, the results of which appeared in the 2008 IPAS study and analysis publication, 85 schools corporations reported that they had no policies relative to seclusion or restraint. A sampling of these school corporations were resurveyed during FY 2010. Of the 25 schools contacted 17 responded.</p>	
<p>3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable):</p> <p>Eight corporations reported that they have developed policies since the last survey. Four corporations reported that polices were currently in development, while four again reported that no policies have been developed. The remaining school reported that the IPAS request would be answered "as the information was gathered". Of those developing policies, one corporation responded that it is waiting for a developed policy to be provided by NEOLA®, a nationwide organization that consults with school corporations on policy development. Seventy-eight school corporations or approximately 30% of the state's schools reported to IPAS in 2006 that they subscribed to NEOLA®. This may be an indication of the possible number of school corporations in the state that will have educational seclusion and restraint policies implemented.</p>	
<p>4. Explain whether pursuing this priority involved collaborative efforts by other entities. If so, describe this collaboration:</p> <p>IPAS continues to participate in the National Disability Rights Network (NDRN) roundtable that studies educational seclusion and restraint. Nationally, a version of the House approved bill on educational seclusion and restraint was introduced in the US Senate prior the congressional Fall 2010 break.</p>	
<p>5. If this was this addressed through individual advocacy, provide the number of cases handled under the priority.</p> <p>Not a case related indicator.</p>	
<p>6. If this priority addressed systemic advocacy or capacity building of the service delivery system for persons with developmental disabilities, please describe how including indicating if any were class actions.</p> <p>N/A</p>	
<p>7. Was this priority targeted to under/unserved and minority populations? If so please describe whether or not services to the targeted population resulted in an increase in clients served.</p> <p>No.</p>	
8. Provide at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the priority.	

Not a case related indicator.

9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority ? \$0

10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year ? Yes

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: Indiana

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/01/2009 - 09/30/2010

Expiration Date: 09/30/2011

Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals: Priority 3 Indicator 1 Education and Training

List reporting year priorities from the Statement of Objectives and Priorities in order by priority.

For each priority, provide the following information:

1. Priority number: 3	Priority Description: Education & Training
------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------

2. Identify and describe indicators PADD used to determine successful outcome of activities pursued under this priority:

Indicator number: 1	Indicator Description: Education & Training Activities
----------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------

Indicator is: Met

If "Not Met" was checked, explain:

If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed:
During FY 2010, there were a total of 15 education/training and 12 public information activities reaching approximately 3,224 individuals with relevant disability rights information. During FY 2010, there were a total of 102 agency wide education/training and 24 public information activities reaching approximately 7,003 individuals. Events included educational transition fairs, the ARC annual conference, the Governor's Planning Council Annual Conference, the Indiana ADA Summit, the Indianapolis 2010 Disability Awareness Day Exhibit and the statewide ADA Celebration.

3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable):

4. Explain whether pursuing this priority involved collaborative efforts by other entities. If so, describe this collaboration:

The Building Leadership Series (BLS) completed year five with 18 participants. Three two day workshops over a three month period covered the topics of 1. choice, rights and responsibilities, 2. self determination/self advocacy and 3. person centered planning. A BLS 2 series is being planned for graduates of BLS 1 and will go forward when funding is secured.

5. If this was this addressed through individual advocacy, provide the number of cases handled under the priority.

Not a case related indicator.

6. If this priority addressed systemic advocacy or capacity building of the service delivery system for persons with developmental disabilities, please describe how including indicating if any were class actions.

N/A

7. Was this priority targeted to under/unserved and minority populations? If so please describe whether or not services to the targeted population resulted in an increase in clients served.

No

8. Provide at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the priority.

Not a case related indicator.

9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority ? \$60,000

10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year ? Yes

P & A Program Performance Report PADD PPR

Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals: Priority 3 Indicator 2 Self Advocate Support

List reporting year priorities from the Statement of Objectives and Priorities in order by priority.

For each priority, provide the following information:

1. Priority number: 3	Priority Description: Incrs awrnss & slf-advocy by provdng or supprtnng educ & trnng re: disblty rights & exrcse of rights.
------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2. Identify and describe indicators PADD used to determine successful outcome of activities pursued under this priority:

Indicator number: 2	Indicator Description: Support education and training efforts of self-advocate based organizations to increase awareness of disability rights.
----------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Indicator is:Met

If "Not Met" was checked, explain:

If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed:

IPAS provided a \$5000 transportation grant to the Board of Directors of the Self Advocates of Indiana (SAI) for reimbursement of board members who travel from all parts of Indiana to Indianapolis for monthly board meetings. IPAS met with the Autism Society of Indiana (ASI) Executive Director and reviewed IPAS' mission, its programs, priorities and objectives, including information and referral. ASI will be implementing a program called "Allies" in October. This program has volunteers in each of the BDDS districts who will be available by telephone to connect families of persons and persons with intellectual and other developmental disabilities with needed resources. IPAS met with the Board of Directors of the Self Advocates of Indiana (SAI) and reviewed the IPAS strategic plan for FY 2011. The board members' input was forwarded to the IPAS Commission to be part of its deliberation in approving the FY 2011 IPAS strategic plan.

<p>3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable): IPAS spoke with Betty Williams, the Self Advocates (SAI) of Indiana President regarding the determination of future training events that would benefit the SAI Board of Directors, e.g., community accessibility. Although training was not able to be scheduled during FY 2010, it is anticipated that this can be done in FY 2011. Outreach was made to the statewide Powerful Parents Groups by providing them with informational flyers on accessibility for distribution to their 40 chapters.</p>
<p>4. Explain whether pursuing this priority involved collaborative efforts by other entities. If so, describe this collaboration: The Self Advocates of Indiana are supported by the Governor's Planning Council for Persons with Disabilities and the ARC of Indiana as well as IPAS.</p>
<p>5. If this was this addressed through individual advocacy, provide the number of cases handled under the priority. Not a case related indicator.</p>
<p>6. If this priority addressed systemic advocacy or capacity building of the service delivery system for persons with developmental disabilities, please describe how including indicating if any were class actions.</p>
<p>7. Was this priority targeted to under/unserved and minority populations? If so please describe whether or not services to the targeted population resulted in an increase in clients served. No</p>
<p>8. Provide at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the priority.</p>
<p>9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority ? \$0</p>
<p>10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year ?Yes</p>

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: Indiana

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/01/2009 - 09/30/2010

Expiration Date: 09/30/2011

Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals: Priority 3 Indicator 3 Child Care Education and Training

List reporting year priorities from the Statement of Objectives and Priorities in order by priority.	
For each priority, provide the following information:	
1. Priority	Priority Description: Incrs awrnss & slf-advocy by provdng or supprtnng

number: 3	educ & trnng re: disblty rights & exrcse of rights.
2. Identify and describe indicators PADD used to determine successful outcome of activities pursued under this priority:	
Indicator number: 3	Indicator Description: Provide info regarding disability rights and IPAS services at two events related to access & provision of child care.
Indicator is: Met	
If "Not Met" was checked, explain:	
If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed: During FY 2010 Information regarding IPAS and disability rights was disseminated at three education/training events and one public information event, reaching a total of 465 individuals. Education and Training Activities: 10/14/09, Department of Children's Services (Foster Parents of Marion County) presentation to 265 individuals 01/26/2010, Children's Bureau presentation to 30 individuals 03/12/2010, GAL/CASA Director Training to 70 individuals General Public Information Activity: 10/14/09, Foster care appreciation dinner 2009, 100 in attendance	
3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable): None	
4. Explain whether pursuing this priority involved collaborative efforts by other entities. If so, describe this collaboration: N/A	
5. If this was this addressed through individual advocacy, provide the number of cases handled under the priority. Not a case related indicator	
6. If this priority addressed systemic advocacy or capacity building of the service delivery system for persons with developmental disabilities, please describe how including indicating if any were class actions. N/A	
7. Was this priority targeted to under/unserved and minority populations? If so please describe whether or not services to the targeted population resulted in an increase in clients served. No	
8. Provide at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the priority. Not a case related indicator	
9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority ? \$0	
10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year ? Yes	

Grantee: Indiana

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/01/2009 - 09/30/2010

Expiration Date: 09/30/2011

Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals: Priority 3 Indicator 4 Groups and Committees

List reporting year priorities from the Statement of Objectives and Priorities in order by priority.

For each priority, provide the following information:

1. Priority number: 3	Priority Description: Incrs awrnss & slf-advocy by provdng or supprtnng educ & trnng re: disblty rights & exrcse of rights.
------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2. Identify and describe indicators PADD used to determine successful outcome of activities pursued under this priority:

Indicator number: 4	Indicator Description: Participate in groups & committees to strengthen policies & practices for persons with an ID/DD diagnosis
----------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Indicator is:Met

If "Not Met" was checked, explain:

If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed:

No cases were handled under this indicator. In the capacity of ex-officio members of human rights committees at four state operated facilities and two large private ICF-MR facilities, IPAS reviewed behavior support plans for restrictive and aversive interventions, including the use of psychotropic medication or personal possession misuse and restriction of privileges.

The Indiana Partners for Equal Justice coordination responsibilities were handed over to the state UCEDD during FY 2010. Due to lack of staff the UCEDD was not able to hold any meetings. The Indiana Society for Autism which had begun a separate but similar equal justice effort has invited all members of the original partners group to participate with them. The Partners in Equal Justice name will be used and the group plans to lay out goals for completion during FY 2011.

3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable):

IPAS participated on the state DD Community Residential Facilities Council (CRFC) as an ex-officio member. The CRFC reviews licenses for group homes, approves waiver services providers & approves providers of other services, e.g., behavioral services, music therapy, day services, home accommodations and remote camera monitoring of waiver residences.

IPAS raised two major matters with the state Division of Disability and Rehabilitative Services (DDRS) in regard to their support of the CRFC: 1. closed executive sessions to interview providers of other waiver services, e.g., day services and others listed in the above paragraph; 2. non compliance with the open door law in lack of posting meeting notice in the state on line calendar.

Outcome: The CRFC no longer holds closed sessions to interview potential service providers. Members of the public can now attend & hear discussions. DDRS has promised that they will post future meetings on line & IPAS will monitor this during FY 2011.

4. Explain whether pursuing this priority involved collaborative efforts by other entities. If so, describe this collaboration:

IPAS financially supported "The Big Minds" project of the new initiative of the Arc of Indiana, Building Pathways to Empowerment. The Big Minds project consisted of experts from across the United States who met to take a fresh look at Indiana's system of programs and services for people with developmental disabilities and their families. The goal is to redesign and redefine that system into one that provides people with what they want and need in the most sensible way possible. The report developed by "The Big Minds" group is now in the hands of the Indiana Response Team which will work to implement the system refinements recommended by the group.

5. If this was this addressed through individual advocacy, provide the number of cases handled under the priority.

Not a case related indicator.

6. If this priority addressed systemic advocacy or capacity building of the service delivery system for persons with developmental disabilities, please describe how including indicating if any were class actions.

Through its participation on the CRFC, IPAS prompted the state Bureau of Developmental Disability Services (BDDS) to join a task force effort which is addressing the specialized needs of person with a diagnosis of an intellectual or other developmental disability, mental health challenge and hearing impairment. The task force members include persons from the state Department of Mental Health and Addiction and state Deaf Services. Also through its participation on the CRFC IPAS has prompted BDDS to review the vague language in forms presented annually to guardians of persons with intellectual and other developmental disabilities that they must sign to waive their choice to move to the community.

7. Was this priority targeted to under/unserved and minority populations? If so please describe whether or not services to the targeted population resulted in an increase in clients served.

No.

8. Provide at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the priority.

Not a case related indicator.

9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority ? \$0

10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year ? Yes

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee:
Indiana
Reporting
Period:
10/01/200
9 -
09/30/201
0

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160
Expiration Date: 09/30/2011

Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals: Priority 3 Indicator 5 Cooperative Housing Project

List reporting year priorities from the Statement of Objectives and Priorities in order by priority.	
For each priority, provide the following information:	
1. Priority number: 3	Priority Description: Incrs awrnss & slf-advocy by provdng or supprtnng educ & trnng re: disblty rights & exrcse of rights.
2. Identify and describe indicators PADD used to determine successful outcome of activities pursued under this priority:	
Indicator number: 5	Indicator Description: Collaborate with Governors Council, state UCEDD, state Back Home in Indiana Alliance to continue to provide training.
Indicator is: Partially Met/Continuing	
If "Not Met" was checked, explain:	
If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed: IPAS was a financial sponsor of the Back Home in Indiana Alliance in FY 2009 and even though IPAS chose not to financially support this effort in FY 2010, was invited to continue to be a member of the Back Home steering committee. IPAS received no notification of meetings for the first six months of FY 2010. After the IPAS staff who was participating resigned, IPAS chose to no longer participate.	
3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable): None.	
4. Explain whether pursuing this priority involved collaborative efforts by other entities. If so, describe this collaboration: IPAS was not made aware of meetings and therefore did not have the opportunity to collaborate with the other involved organizations.	
5. If this was this addressed through individual advocacy, provide the number of cases handled under the priority. Not a case related indicator.	
6. If this priority addressed systemic advocacy or capacity building of the service delivery system for persons with developmental disabilities, please describe how including indicating if any were class actions. N/A	
7. Was this priority targeted to under/unserved and minority populations? If so please describe whether or not services to the targeted population resulted in an increase in clients served. No.	
8. Provide at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the priority. Not a case related indicator.	
9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority ? \$0	

10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year ?No

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: Indiana

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/01/2009 - 09/30/2010

Expiration Date: 09/30/2011

Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals: Priority 4 Indicator 1 Information and Referral

List reporting year priorities from the Statement of Objectives and Priorities in order by priority.

For each priority, provide the following information:

1. Priority number: 4	Priority Description: Provide accurate information re disability rights & to the exercise of rights & refer calls to service when IPAS cannot assist
------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2. Identify and describe indicators PADD used to determine successful outcome of activities pursued under this priority:

Indicator number: 1	Indicator Description: IPAS will respond within two working days to requests for information or assistance.
----------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Indicator is:Met

If "Not Met" was checked, explain:

If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed:
Requests for information and referral in FY 2010 numbered 553. Follow up calls were made to 24 individuals who participated in the satisfaction survey (PADD related calls). This constitutes a 5% survey sample. Of these 24 participants 92% indicated that they found the information which they gained to be helpful and 96% said that they would call IPAS again if they should have a disability rights concern or problem. Total agency web site hits for the year numbered 63,425.

3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable):

Comments from callers who responded to our satisfaction survey include:

"The advocate is very good at what she does."

"Thank you for all you have done."

"Because (of) IPAS we are able to continue to provide the live (sic) saving care our child must have. It is such a blessing that ipas (sic) helped our family."

4. Explain whether pursuing this priority involved collaborative efforts by other entities. If so, describe this collaboration:

IPAS receives referrals from its DD Network Partners and other community grass roots organizations.

5. If this was this addressed through individual advocacy, provide the number of cases handled under the priority. Not a case related indicator.
6. If this priority addressed systemic advocacy or capacity building of the service delivery system for persons with developmental disabilities, please describe how including indicating if any were class actions. N/A
7. Was this priority targeted to under/unserved and minority populations? If so please describe whether or not services to the targeted population resulted in an increase in clients served. No
8. Provide at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the priority. Not a case related indicator.
9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority ? \$47,500
10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year ? Yes

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: Indiana

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/01/2009 - 09/30/2010

Expiration Date: 09/30/2011

Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals: Priority 4 Indicator 2 Minority and Underserved Outreach

List reporting year priorities from the Statement of Objectives and Priorities in order by priority.	
For each priority, provide the following information:	
1. Priority number: 4	Priority Description: Provide accurate information re dis rights & to the exerc of rights & refer calls to serv when IPAS cant asst
2. Identify and describe indicators PADD used to determine successful outcome of activities pursued under this priority:	
Indicator number: 2	Indicator Description: IPAS will outreach to minority & underserved individuals wt disabilities, concerning disability rights issues & services
Indicator is: Met	
If "Not Met" was checked, explain:	
If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed: During FY 2010 there were two outreach activities specifically targeting minority and underserved individuals: 1. Children's Bureau presentation to service providers and case managers regarding IPAS services and children with disabilities in the foster care system.	

Approximately 20 individuals present. 2. GAL/CASA Director Train the Trainer presentation to approximately 70 individuals. Introduced the "Understanding the Needs of Children with Disabilities in the Foster Care System" training module to CASA/GAL statewide directors. The training module is also posted on the IPAS web site.

3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable):

4. Explain whether pursuing this priority involved collaborative efforts by other entities. If so, describe this collaboration:

The Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives which oversees AmeriCorps/VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America) a professional national volunteer service program which provides full-time volunteer members to agencies, institutions and organizations to create and expand initiatives that ultimately bring low-income individuals and communities out of poverty, requested IPAS' participation regarding the development of an outreach program targeted at recruiting volunteers from the disability and aged/aging communities.

5. If this was this addressed through individual advocacy, provide the number of cases handled under the priority.

Not a case related indicator.

6. If this priority addressed systemic advocacy or capacity building of the service delivery system for persons with developmental disabilities, please describe how including indicating if any were class actions.

N/A

7. Was this priority targeted to under/unserved and minority populations? If so please describe whether or not services to the targeted population resulted in an increase in clients served.

Yes. Advocacy case services were provided during FY 2010 to persons who identified themselves as the following: twenty-six Black (non Hispanic/Latino) and two Hispanic/Latino. This is a 25% increase in number served over FY 2009. Presentations were also made to persons who have a relationship with youth with Intellectual and other Developmental Disabilities in the Foster Care system. Approximately 90 persons benefited.

8. Provide at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the priority.

Not a case related indicator.

9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority ? \$0

10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year ?Yes

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: Indiana

Reporting Period: 10/01/2009 - 09/30/2010

Section 7 Developmental Disabilities Network Collaboration

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Expiration Date: 09/30/2011

A. Provide information related to only those issues / barriers affecting individuals with

developmental disabilities and their families in your State that the DDC, P&A, and UCEDD (the DD network) have jointly identified as critical State issues /barriers:

Using short titles, list 5-10 areas that the DDC, P&A, and UCEDD have identified as critical State issues/barriers. Then, identify at least one issue/barrier selected by your State DD Network for joint collaboration:

1.Lack of state funding for human services.

2.Continued risk of persons with ID/DD to abuse and neglect.

3.Lack of ID/DD Empowerment resulting in increased dependence & other life area restrictions.

4.Lack of employment opportunities for persons with ID/DD.

5.Lack of accessible transportation for persons with ID/DD, especially in rural areas.

6.Lack of affordable accessible housing as well as informed housing choice.

7.Students with disabilities do not receive FAPE in violation of federal and state laws.

8.Lack of equal access to Criminal Justice System.

9.Persons with ID/DD continue to encounter discrimination in the provision of critical services.

10.Lack of qualified and well trained staff to work in community residential settings.

P & A Program Performance Report PADD PPR

Grantee: Indiana

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/01/2009 - 09/30/2010

Expiration Date: 09/30/2011

Section 7 Issues/Barriers Elaboration: Pathways to Empowerment

B. Provide the following information for at least one of the issues/barriers selected for DD Network collaboration. Repeat this section to report any other issue/barrier selected for DD Network collaboration:

1. Issue/Barrier number (from A in Section VII): 1

2. Provide a brief description of the collaborative issue/barrier and expected outcome(s):

Due to the ongoing decreasing revenue forecasted for the state of Indiana, the Indiana ARC developed the Building Pathways to Empowerment Project to take a fresh look at the delivery of services for persons with Intellectual and other Developmental Disabilities.

The expected outcome is that persons with Intellectual and other Developmental Disabilities and their family members have an increased understanding regarding the limitations of state provided services as well as being open to explore more nontraditional ways to deliver services.

3. Reference applicable SGP Goals(s): Priority number(s): 1 2 3 4 0 0

4. Describe the P&A's specific roles and responsibilities in this collaborative effort:

IPAS is a financial supporter of this effort along with the Governor's Planning Council and the UCEDD.

5. Briefly identify problems, if any, encountered as a result of this collaboration:

None to date.
6. Describe unexpected benefits, if any, of this collaborative effort: None to date.
7. If your P&A can provide technical assistance expertise in this area to other States, please describe:
8. If any, describe the technical assistance needs the P&A/DD Network have in this area:

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: Indiana

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/01/2009 - 09/30/2010

Expiration Date: 09/30/2011

Section 8 Coordination

Check if the following programs are housed in the same organization as the P&A program:
Client Assistance Program (CAP) ✓
Long Term Care Ombudsman (Older Americans Act)
Other
If other, please list: N/A
If the Client Assistance Program (CAP) and the Long Term Care Ombudsman (Older Americans Act) are not part of the P&A System (PADD, PAIMI, PAIR and PAAT programs) describe coordination between the PADD program and the CAP and the Long Term Care Ombudsman (Older Americans Act.) Ongoing communication exists between PADD and the Long Term Care Ombudsman Program. Referrals are exchanged.
Describe your system's relations with agencies other than above and any inter-agency agreements or joint projects you may have, other than mentioned above. N/A
Section VIII. Services Provided Using Non-Part C Funding:
Are services and activities benefiting persons with developmental disabilities and their families supported by funding other than that provided by Part C of the DD Act or its program income: No
Please describe the projects funded with non-part C funding or its program income: N/A

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: Indiana

Reporting Period: 10/01/2009 - 09/30/2010

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Expiration Date: 09/30/2011

Section 9 Comments and Clarifications

Comments and Clarifications:

Section 3 E1-3 . . . Customer satisfaction- Seventy surveys were sent and 9 returned for a return rate of 13%. All surveys returned expressed 100% satisfaction with IPAS services received.

Before a service request is closed, the IPAS advocate contacts the person served, advising them that their case will be closed and asking them to return the satisfaction survey. A self addressed stamped envelope provided for ease of return.